



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/487,383	01/18/2000	Michael R. Bedford	68019	3100
22242	7590	05/21/2002		
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			EXAMINER	
			MELLER, MICHAEL V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
DATE MAILED: 05/21/2002				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/487,383	BEDFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael V. Meller	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,6-8,13,15,17,18,21-26 and 29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The application claims a method for treating a bacterial infection in a chicken wherein chickens having a bacterial infection caused by bacteria are fed an animal feed with xylanase, cellulase, or beta-glucanase. The application only teaches a method of preventing or treating a bacterial infection as a future possibility. There is no disclosure which identifies a sick chicken and then administers the feed with the enzyme in it. The specification only teaches that the feed can be used to treat or prevent bacterial

infections in chickens, but there is absolutely no disclosure of isolating or identifying out the chickens that are sick and treating them specifically for the infection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,287,867 in view of Bedford '055 or Bedford '678 for the reasons of record and for the reasons which follow.

The reference teaches feeding chickens feed which contains xylanase that improves utilization of the feed by the chickens. When feeding chickens the xylanase containing feed it would have been obvious to identify chickens that are sick such as having one of the claimed infections since it is routine in raising chickens to identify sick chickens and it would have been obvious to continue feeding the feed to the sick chickens for the same reasons as feeding it to the healthy chickens since the feed makes the chickens grow better and be healthier. Obviously chickens that are healthier can resist infection better.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarkson et al. in view of Bedford '055 or Bedford '678 for the reasons of record and for the reasons which follow.

The reference teaches feeding chickens feed which contains xylanase that improves utilization of the feed by the chickens. When feeding chickens the xylanase containing feed it would have been obvious to identify chickens that are sick such as having one of the claimed infections since it is routine in raising chickens to identify sick chickens and it would have been obvious to continue feeding the feed to the sick chickens for the same reasons as feeding it to the healthy chickens since the feed makes the chickens grow better and be healthier. Obviously chickens that are healthier can resist infection better.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. in view of GB 2,287,867 for the reasons of record and for the reasons which follow.

The reference teaches feeding chickens feed which contains xylanase that improves utilization of the feed by the chickens. When feeding chickens the xylanase containing feed it would have been obvious to identify chickens that are sick such as having one of the claimed infections since it is routine in raising chickens to identify sick chickens and it would have been obvious to continue feeding the feed to the sick chickens for the same reasons as feeding it to the healthy chickens since the feed makes the chickens grow better and be healthier. Obviously chickens that are healthier can resist infection better.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borriess et al. in view of Bedford '055 or Bedford '678 for the reasons of record and for the reasons which follow.

The reference teaches feeding chickens feed which contains xylanase that improves utilization of the feed by the chickens. When feeding chickens the xylanase containing feed it would have been obvious to identify chickens that are sick such as having one of the claimed infections since it is routine in raising chickens to identify sick chickens and it would have been obvious to continue feeding the feed to the sick chickens for the same reasons as feeding it to the healthy chickens since the feed makes the chickens grow better and be healthier. Obviously chickens that are healthier can resist infection better.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedford '055 or Bedford '678 for the reasons of record and for the reasons which follow.

The reference teaches feeding chickens feed which contains xylanase that improves utilization of the feed by the chickens. When feeding chickens the xylanase containing feed it would have been obvious to identify chickens that are sick such as having one of the claimed infections since it is routine in raising chickens to identify sick chickens and it would have been obvious to continue feeding the feed to the sick chickens for the same reasons as feeding it to the healthy chickens since the feed makes the chickens grow better and be healthier. Obviously chickens that are healthier can resist infection better.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 703-308-4230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 703-308-4743. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Michael V. Meller
Examiner
Art Unit 1651

MVM
May 17, 2002